



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,065	03/04/2002	Anders Vinberg	063170.7028	8010
5073 7590 07/29/2008 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980				
EXAMINER				
LEE, PHILIP C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2152				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/29/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/091,065

Applicant(s)

VINBERG, ANDERS

Examiner

PHILIP C. LEE

Art Unit

2152

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11,13-20 and 31-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11,13-20 and 31-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/55/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/17/08, 2/26/08, 1/24/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on April 9, 2008.
2. Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-20 and 31-34 are presented for examination, claims 21-30 are withdrawn from consideration, and claims 2, 10 and 12 are canceled.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Objection

4. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities: element 115 is being referred to both "the management application 115" and "computer processing system 115". Examiner suggests deleting "computer processing system 115".
5. Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: As per claim 33, line 3, "for the subject system object" should be deleted.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

6. Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 11, 13-15 and 33-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul, U.S. Patent 6,125,390 (hereinafter Touboul) and Dev et al, U.S. Patent 6,049,828 (hereinafter Dev) in view of Jacobs, U.S. Patent 5,761,502 (hereinafter Jacobs).

7. Touboul, Dev, and Jacobs were cited in the last office action.
8. As per claims 1 and 11, Touboul taught the invention substantially as claimed for reporting the context of an alert condition, comprising:
 - reporting an alert condition associated with a subject system object (col. 8, lines 10-12; col. 6, lines 54-61);
 - analyzing the system objects associated with the alert condition to obtain the context data (col. 5, lines 7-10; col. 4, lines 39-44; col. 7, lines 40-49);
 - generating a context message based on the context data (col. 5, lines 7-10; col. 7, lines 40-49); and
 - outputting the context message (col. 8, lines 31-34; col. 14, lines 6-7, 20-23).
9. Touboul did not teach receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated dialogue request specifying context data. Dev taught receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue request specifying a user defined type of context data for the subject system object (col. 8, lines 11-14; col. 15, lines 16-18; 420, fig. 10) (i.e., clicking on the condition red); and the context message responsive to the user-generated request dialogue (col. 8, lines 31-37; col. 15, lines 12-29). (dialogue request is interpreted as a user input requesting a machine response that form a “conversation”)

10. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul and Dev because Dev's teaching of a user-generated dialogue request would make it easier for user in Touboul's system to request more information regarding an alarm condition.

11. Touboul and Dev do not teach context data for relevant system objects known to be associated with the subject system object and accessing a database to identify a group of system objects known to be associated with one another. Jacobs taught context data for the subject system object and one or more relevant system object known to be associated with the subject system object (col. 9, lines 48-54; col. 14, lines 46-52; fig. 6); accessing a database to identify a group of system objects known to be associated with one another (col. 8, lines 5-7; col. 9, lines 9-14, 24-37; col. 14, lines 11-19); and identifying, from the group of system objects, a relevant system object that is known to be associated with the subject system object (col. 9, lines 48-54; col. 13, lines 8-63; col. 14, lines 38-53).

12. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev and Jacobs because Jacobs's teaching of accessing a database to identify a group of system object known to be associated with one another would increase the alertness of network management personnel in their systems by providing a view of the current state of the network that correlates related network events (col. 2, lines 29-65).

13. As per claim 9, Touboul taught the invention substantially as claimed for reporting the context of an alert condition, comprising:

a management application processor (fig. 1) comprising:

means for reporting an alert condition associated with a subject system object (col. 8, lines 10-12; col. 6, lines 54-61);

means for analyzing the system objects associated with the alert condition to obtain context data (col. 5, lines 7-10; col. 4, lines 39-44; col. 7, lines 40-49);

means for generating a context message based on the context data (col. 5, lines 7-10; col. 7, lines 40-49); and

means for outputting the context message (col. 8, lines 31-34; col. 14, lines 6-7, 20-23).

14. Touboul did not teach means for receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated dialogue request specifying context data. Dev taught means for receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue request specifying a user defined type of context data for the subject system object (col. 8, lines 11-14; col. 15, lines 16-18; 420, fig. 10) (i.e., clicking on the condition red); and the context message responsive to the user-generated request dialogue (col. 8, lines 31-37; col. 15, lines 12-29). (dialogue request is interpreted as a user input requesting a machine response that form a “conversation”)

15. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul and Dev because Dev’s teaching of a

user-generated dialogue request would make it easier for user in Touboul's system to request more information regarding an alarm condition.

16. Touboul and Dev do not teach context data for relevant system objects known to be associated with the subject system object and means for accessing a database to identify a group of system objects known to be associated with one another. Jacobs taught context data for the subject system object and one or more relevant system object known to be associated with the subject system object (col. 9, lines 48-54; col. 14, lines 46-52; fig. 6); means for accessing a database to identify a group of system objects known to be associated with one another (col. 8, lines 5-7; col. 9, lines 9-14, 24-37; col. 14, lines 11-19); and means for identifying, from the group of system objects, a relevant system object that is known to be associated with the subject system object (col. 9, lines 48-54; col. 13, lines 8-63; col. 14, lines 38-53).

17. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev and Jacobs because Jacobs's teaching of accessing a database to identify a group of system object known to be associated with one another would increase the alertness of network management personnel in their systems by providing a view of the current state of the network that correlates related network events (col. 2, lines 29-65).

18. As per claims 3 and 13, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 11 above. Touboul further taught wherein the analyzing includes determining properties of the subject system object (col. 7, lines 40-49).

19. As per claims 4 and 14, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 11 above. Touboul further taught wherein analyzing includes determining a physical location of a component represented by the subject system object (col. 4, lines 39-44).

20. As per claims 5 and 15, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 11 above. Jacobs further taught wherein analyzing includes determining a logical relationship of a component represented by the subject system object to a component represented by the relevant system object (col. 13, lines 8-63; col. 14, lines 38-52).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev and Jacobs for the same reason set forth in claim 1 above.

22. As per claim 33, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Although Dev teaches the type of user defined context data is selected from any information contained in the event message (col. 8, lines 11-19), however, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs do not specifically teach user defined context data is selected from the group consisting of

location information for the subject system object, logical relationship information of the subject system object to other system objects, operational status information of the subject system object, or information regarding interest/business groups associated with the subject system object. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include context data such as location information for the subject system object in the event message because by doing so it could notify a user where to resolve the event.

23. As per claim 34, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Dev further teach wherein the user-generated text-based dialogue request comprises a first user-generated text-based dialogue request specifying a user defined type of context data (col. 8, lines 11-14; col. 15, lines 16-18; 420, fig. 10) (i.e., clicking on the condition red); and further comprising: after outputting the context message, receiving a second user-generated text-based dialogue request specifying a second user defined type of context data (col. 15, lines 27-29) (by clicking on other alarm).

24. Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul, Dev and Jacobs in view of Cox, U.S. Patent 6,011,838 (hereinafter Cox).

25. Cox was cited in the last office action.

26. As per claims 6 and 16, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 11 above. Touboul, Dev and Jacobs did not teach determining a traffic

load associated with the subject system object. Cox taught determining a traffic load associated with a system object (col. 3, lines 30-50).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev, Jacobs and Cox because Cox's teaching of determining a traffic load would increase the efficiency of Touboul's, Dev's and Jacobs's systems by minimize the amount of failure cause by overloading a system object (col. 1, lines 11-15).

28. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul, Dev and Jacobs in view of Grace, U.S. Patent 5,748,098 (hereinafter Grace).

29. Grace was cited in the last office action.

30. As per claims 7 and 17, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 11 above. Touboul, Dev and Jacobs did not explicit teach a component that is dependent on a component represented by the subject system object. Grace taught wherein the relevant system object representing a component that is dependent on a component represented by the subject system object (col. 1, lines 40-56; col. 3, lines 5-15).

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev, Jacobs and Grace because Grace's teaching

of relevant system object representing a component that is dependent on a component represented by the subject system object would increase efficiency of Touboul's, Dev's and Jacobs's systems by avoiding time wasted on investigating the sources of all the alert condition associated with dependent resources (col. 1, lines 40-56).

32. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul, Dev and Jacobs in view of Faigon et al, U.S. Patent 6,006,016 (hereinafter Faigon).

33. As per claims 8 and 18, Touboul taught the invention substantially as claimed for reporting the context of an alert condition, comprising:

reporting an alert condition associated with a subject system object (col. 8, lines 10-12; col. 6, lines 54-61);

analyzing the system objects associated with the alert condition to obtain context data (col. 5, lines 7-10; col. 4, lines 39-44; col. 7, lines 40-49);

generating a context message based on the context data (col. 5, lines 7-10; col. 7, lines 40-49); and

outputting the context message (col. 8, lines 31-34; col. 14, lines 6-7, 20-23).

34. Touboul did not teach receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated dialogue request requesting context data. Dev taught receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue request requesting context data for the subject system object (col. 8, lines 31-37; col. 15, lines 12-29); and the context

Art Unit: 2152

message responsive to the user-generated request dialogue (col. 8, lines 31-37; col. 15, lines 12-29). (dialogue request is interpreted as a user input requesting a machine response that form a "conversation")

35. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul and Dev because Dev's teaching of a user-generated dialogue request would make it easier for user in Touboul's system to request more information regarding an alarm condition.

36. Touboul and Dev do not teach context data for relevant system objects known to be associated with the subject system object and accessing a database to identify a group of system objects known to be associated with one another. Jacobs taught context data for the subject system object and one or more relevant system object known to be associated with the subject system object (col. 9, lines 48-54; col. 14, lines 46-52; fig. 6); accessing a database to identify a group of system objects known to be associated with one another (col. 8, lines 5-7; col. 9, lines 9-14, 24-37; col. 14, lines 11-19); and identifying, from the group of system objects, a relevant system object that is known to be associated with the subject system object (col. 9, lines 48-54; col. 13, lines 8-63; col. 14, lines 38-53).

37. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev and Jacobs because Jacobs's teaching of accessing a database to identify a group of system object known to be associated with

one another would increase the alertness of network management personnel in their systems by providing a view of the current state of the network that correlates related network events (col. 2, lines 29-65).

38. Touboul, Dev and Jacobs did not teach wherein generating includes replacing quantifiable context data with a qualitative identifier. Faigon taught wherein generating includes replacing quantifiable context data with a qualitative identifier (col. 18, lines 20, 42-45, 55-66; figs. 19 and 20).

39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev, Jacobs and Faigon because Faigon's teaching of replacing quantifiable context data with a qualitative identifier would increase the user flexibility in Touboul's, Dev's and Jacobs's systems by allowing a user to specify the severity level ranges being assigned to a severity levels.

40. Claims 19-20 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul, Dev and Jacobs in view of Fanshier et al, U.S. Patent 5,933,601 (hereinafter Fanshier).

41. Fanshier was cited in the last office action

42. As per claims 19 and 31, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 11 above. Touboul, Dev and Jacobs did not specifically detailing the

relevant system object represents a sub-component of the subject system object. Fanshier taught wherein the relevant system object represents a component that is a sub-component of a component represented by the subject system (fig. 3; col. 5, lines 15-41).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev, Jacobs and Fanshier because Fanshier's teaching of the relevant system object represents a component that is a sub-component of a component represented by the subject system would increase the alertness of Touboul's, Dev's and Jacobs's systems by providing the relationship of components using an object-based presentation of components executed by each of the nodes within a network in a hierarchy form (col. 1, lines 36-44).

44. As per claims 20 and 32, Touboul, Dev and Jacobs taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 11 above. Touboul, Dev and Jacobs did not specifically detailing the relevant system object represents a grouping with the subject system object. Fanshier taught wherein the relevant system object represents a component that is in a grouping with a component represented by the subject system object (fig. 3; col. 5, lines 15-41).

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Touboul, Dev, Jacobs and Fanshier because Fanshier's teaching of the relevant system object represents a component that is in a grouping with a component represented by the subject system object would increase the alertness of Touboul's,

Dev's and Jacobs's systems by providing the relationship of components using an object-based presentation of components executed by each of the nodes within a network in a hierarchy form (col. 1, lines 36-44).

46. Applicant's arguments filed 04/09/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

47. In the remarks, applicant argued that:

- (1) Dev fails to teach a "request specifying a user defined type of context data"
- (2) Nishida fails to teach replacing quantifiable context data with a qualitative identifier".
- (3) The cited references fail to teach receiving a second request specifying a second user defined type of context data.

48. In response to point (1), Dev teaches a user clicking (i.e., user-generated text based request) specifies more information on the "condition red" (i.e., user defined type of context data) (420, fig. 10; col. 15, lines 16-18). "Condition red" is a severity defined by a user (col. 8, lines 11-14) (i.e., a user defined type of context data).

49. In response to point (2), applicant's argument is moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection.

50. In response to point (3), Dev teaches a user clicking on other alarms in the alarm list (col. 15, lines 27-28) (i.e., receiving a second request). As explained in point (1) above, a user clicking on other alarm is considered as a second request specifying a second user defined type of context data.

51. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip C Lee/

Art Unit: 2152

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152